

S U P P L E M E N T

TO THE

NONCONFORMIST.

VOL. XXIII.—NEW SERIES, No. 943.]

LONDON : WEDNESDAY, NOV. 25, 1863.

[GRATIS.]

THE LIBERATION SOCIETY.

CONFERENCE AT MANCHESTER.

On Wednesday, Nov. 18, an important Conference of the friends of the Liberation Society was held in the Assembly-room, Free-trade Hall, Manchester. It was convened by a circular, signed by forty of the leading supporters of the society residing in Lancashire and Cheshire, and its special purpose was to consider the future parliamentary and electoral policy of the friends of religious equality. About two hundred gentlemen attended from various parts of Lancashire, Cheshire, and Staffordshire, and among them were Mr. Hadfield, M.P., Sir James Watt, Mr. R. Rumney, the Rev. J. Clark, Mr. Joseph Spencer, Mr. W. Armitage, the Rev. A. McLaren, B.A., the Rev. T. G. Lee, Mr. T. Roberts, Mr. Hugh Mason, Mr. B. Armitage, Mr. Henry Lee, Mr. Chas. Potter, Mr. J. Kingsley, the Rev. J. A. Macfadyen, M.A., Rev. A. Thomson, M.A., Mr. Peter Spence, Rev. A. Mursell, Rev. J. B. Kennerley, Rev. S. Chisholm, Rev. J. Garside, Rev. S. Dobson, Rev. T. H. Weeks, Rev. J. Muncaster, Professor Newth, Rev. J. G. Rogers, of Ashton, Rev. T. Green, of Ashton, Mr. T. Pidduck, Mr. H. Pidduck, and the Rev. R. H. Smith, of Hanley; Mr. J. Petrie, of Rochdale; Mr. S. C. Kell, of Bradford; Mr. W. Hinners, of Farnworth; Rev. A. Fraser, of Blackburn; Mr. Phillips, of Buralem; Mr. S. Rigby, of Warrington; Rev. J. T. Shawcross, of Burnley; Rev. W. Knox, of Kirkham; Rev. G. Snashall and Rev. H. W. Parkinson, of Rochdale; Rev. R. Best, of Bolton; Rev. J. Wilson, of Haslingden; Rev. G. W. Conder, of Leeds; Rev. J. Brown, of Bamford; Rev. J. B. Lister, of Blackburn; Mr. Nicholson, of Leek; Mr. Nicholson, of Macclesfield; Rev. J. Wright, of Bury; Mr. J. S. Job, of Heywood; Mr. R. C. Johnson, of Liverpool; Mr. Phipps, of Shrewsbury; Mr. Roberts, of Chester; Rev. A. M. Stalker, of Southport; Alderman Hoole, of Blackburn; and Rev. H. Lings, of Fleetwood. A number of the students from the Lancashire Independent College were also present.

The Executive Committee of the society were represented by a deputation, consisting of Mr. Edward Miall, Mr. J. Carvell Williams, and Mr. Charles Robertson, of Liverpool.

Shortly after eleven o'clock, the proceedings commenced, by the appointment of Jas. Sidebottom, Esq., of Manchester, as chairman, on the motion of Mr. URQUHART, of Liverpool, and Mr. SHANKS, of St. Helens. The Rev. J. SKINNER then offered prayer, after which, on the motion of the Rev. G. B. BUBIER and Mr. R. JOHNSON, of Liverpool, the Rev. P. Thompson, Mr. S. Watt, jun., and Mr. Warburton, were appointed secretaries to the conference. These preliminaries over,

The CHAIRMAN said the first duty that devolved upon him, on behalf of the meeting, was to express gratitude to the gentlemen who formed the deputation for the prompt and kind manner in which they had responded to the invitation to hold a conference in Manchester. He was glad to see present their old friend Mr. Miall, to whom they must always feel deeply indebted. (Hear, hear.) He never looked upon Mr. Miall but with feelings of gratitude that his life had been so long spared, and that he had been enabled, with such energy and power, to advocate the principles which he trusted they all held dear. He was sure all present would join with him in the hope that he might be spared for many years to advocate those great principles of civil and religious liberty to which they were all deeply attached. (Applause.) He thought that the time had come when there was great propriety in a conference like the present. They had been passing through times of more than ordinary interest in reference to their great distinctive principles as Protestant Nonconformists. The recent Bicentenary movement had occasioned an excitement such as had not been witnessed in the country for a great num-

ber of years. He believed that the attention which had been given to their principles would greatly advance the principles which they held. They could not be unconscious of the fact that a controversy had arisen out of the movement which was likely to continue for a considerable time. He trusted that controversy would not be embittered by strife or hard sayings. (Hear, hear.) He should like the controversy to be conducted on both sides with gentlemanliness, Christian propriety, and with the use of arguments only, and not with vituperation of any kind. (Hear, hear.) He did not think they had greatly sinned themselves in that respect, and he would not say that anyone else had done so either, and he trusted that future agitation would be conducted in a manner which would reflect disgrace neither on their Church friends nor on themselves. (Hear, hear.) If they had any regard for their principles, which were founded upon unerring truth, the time was come when they must look anew at their position, and survey the conflict in which, not only they, but their children would be engaged. The work, no doubt, would not be completed in their lifetime. The past was sufficient to afford great encouragement; and the future was not at all dark. True, they might have been to a certain extent put back in connection with the Church-rate question, but even in that there was nothing very discouraging, or calculated to break down their spirits. It was not so much that they had lost their position, as that determined energy had been put forth in defence of Church-rates. The force of the whole Conservative party was exerted upon that question, and the supporters of Church-rates appeared for the time to gain an advantage. But his conviction was that the principles of the Liberation Society were working quietly among a class of people who would one day avow them. It was for the society to place itself in a position to deal with any question which might arise, in the wisest possible manner. There was a great advantage to be gained by such meetings as the present. To those who had the management of the society, and who had an opportunity of obtaining much information, and of watching with the closest interest the course of events in all parts of the country, it appeared that the consideration of the use to be in future made of the electoral franchise was a matter which could not be much longer postponed. He was sick of petitioning the House of Commons as at present constituted; the time was thrown away, and the labour which it involved might be much better employed. Unless the character and disposition of the House could be altered, there was not much to be gained from an appeal to it. But its reign would not last much longer. He rejoiced to see Mr. Hadfield present—(cheers)—and believed that if there were a few other such men in the House, a future Parliament would see something practical done. (Cheers.)

PARLIAMENTARY AND ELECTORAL ACTION.

Mr. EDWARD MIALL was then called upon to read a paper on "The future Parliamentary and electoral action of the Liberation Society," and was received with hearty cheering.

The paper commenced by referring to the recent Parliamentary efforts of the society, and the results which had followed. The singular success which had crowned its earlier action had roused and alarmed the supporters of the Church Establishment. As a consequence, the Church-rate Bill was rejected by the House of Commons; though that had happened, not from a loss of strength, but because the entire party strength of the Conservatives had been put forth to defeat it, while its supporters enjoyed no such advantage in meeting their opposition. Every other measure tending, however slightly, towards religious equality had been defeated. The Endowed Schools Bill and Sir S. M. Peto's Bill had been rejected by the Commons, and the Qualification for Offices Bill by the Lords; and, finally, the select committee to whom the Church-Building Acts Consolidation Bill was referred, had reluctantly refused to insert in it a clause to prevent the levying of Church-rates for district churches, notwithstanding a distinct Parliamentary pledge had been given against such an extension of rates. That was one aspect of the present position of the question in Parliament; but other influences than those exerted by the society had come into play. At the very time when its demands for equality on behalf of those outside the Church Establishment were being scornfully refused, other men's demands for increased liberty to those who were within it were beginning to make themselves heard. The clergy could not exclude Dissenting ministers over the dead in the parochial

churchyards, without subjecting their own consciences to occasional twinges of pain, and they, as well as Dissenters, had a burial "grievance," the scandals occasioned by which had shocked the moral sense of the House of Lords. The University of Oxford was waking up to the conclusion, that ecclesiastical exclusiveness was unfavourable to high mental culture, and that fellowships which were barred against the best scholars by theological tests had the effect of lowering her general intellectual tone and pretensions. Her most eminent men, therefore, had been before the House of Lords as petitioners for a little more freedom. The Bicentenary year seemed to have quickened a sense of clerical uneasiness at the stringency of the oaths and subscriptions required from clerks and beneficiaries, and the debates raised by Lord Ebury in the House of Lords, and by Mr. Charles Buxton in the House of Commons, had attracted notice to questions of vital moment lying at the very foundation of the Establishment. Further, the Irish Church question had been again mooted by both Mr. Dillwyn and Mr. Osborne. There, therefore, was no probability that the great question raised by the society would not, in some one or other of its phases, demand the deliberation of Parliament. Still there would be no doubt as to the predominant feeling of the present House of Commons, and there was no reason to suppose that it would not continue to reject all religious-equality measures as contemptuously as it had done already. Their course, therefore, was clear. They knew the mind and temper of the present House of Commons, and it would betray a want of self-respect to put themselves in the way of further insult. If any fresh aggression on their rights were attempted, they would know how to resist it with their whole force; but it seemed to be their best policy to ask for no further decision at the hands of the present Parliament. What was now wanted was to form what would, in process of time, become an independent political party, strong in its strength, and vitalised and united by the broad principle which it sought to embody in legislation. Was it certain that the next general election would add to the strength of the Liberal party? Had the way in which casual vacancies had been filled up during the last two or three years indicated any coming triumph on the part of the Liberals? Was there any political tenet or principle, with which that party was distinctly identified, calculated to elicit a hearty popular preference of their candidates over those of the Conservatives? They could not shut their eyes to facts patent to everyone. Both Conservatives and Liberals would support substantially the same domestic policy. The main difference between them would relate, not to what ought to be done, but who ought to do it—a Palmerston or a Derby administration. It was a difference which the country would make no great exertion or sacrifice to settle. The upper ten thousand, consequently, would have the game pretty much in their own hands, for, when no great public interest was at stake, the influences permanently at the command of rank, wealth, and official authority, both in Church and State, were almost sure to determine the complexion of a general election. They were to be successfully counteracted by a strong popular enthusiasm; and, unless a great and unlooked-for change intervened, that was not to be anticipated. It seemed extremely doubtful whether a working majority of even nominal Liberals would be returned; but whether the majority be ranged under Lord Palmerston or Lord Derby, the next Parliament would probably be as indisposed as the present to pass measures tending towards religious equality. It might be that the direct Parliamentary action of the society would be comparatively fruitless for several years to come, and if so, the sooner the conclusion was accepted the better, as they would be the more content to give up all thoughts of immediate successes, and to plan their movements with distinct reference to a grander and more distant result. It was always a matter of necessity that, at some stage of the movement, the object at which it aimed should take that precedence in regard to the use of electoral power in possession of its friends, which for a long time past had been given to the Liberal party, merely as such. Hitherto they had been governed in the exercise of the franchise primarily by loyalty to that party, and subordinate by their regard to the principles of religious equality. With their aid, the Liberals had achieved all those changes in the domestic policy of the country which they deemed to be necessary to its welfare. As a party they had nothing more to offer, whilst those who had followed them, and worked with them, had almost everything yet to gain. The utmost they could expect to do was to enable the Liberals to keep their ascendancy in Parliament, and use it as the Conservatives should please. The most probable result, however, of any further postponement of their principles to party connections, would be that neither the one nor the other would be thereby effectually served. A considerable breadth of political barrenness was before them, and whilst they were traversing it, neither they nor the country would expect from the Liberals anything which the Conservatives would not as readily give. Such being the case, might not they who were in pursuit of religious equality reverse the rule of their political action, by giving primary importance to that object, and only subordinate importance to the ascendancy of the Liberals? Might they not do well to insist in every locality upon so

much advantage to their principles as would be fairly proportionate to their local strength, and in the event of their being refused, to decline that electoral co-operation which was to yield them no benefit? Such a line of policy based itself upon a supposition, not that they loved their allies less, but that they loved their principles more. They might still prefer marching with them if they could do so without being excluded from their due share of the advantage to be gained by the march. The House of Commons being an assembly of representatives, it was but reasonable that those whom they helped to elect should represent their opinions in some proportion to the power they put forth to secure the election. If, in a constituency returning two members, Dissenters contributed the larger number, or a full half, of the votes which gave them their seats, they were entitled to claim for themselves the nomination of one of the two accepted candidates. Should the proportion of those who sympathised with them be too inconsiderable to justify a claim to that extent, it might yet be large enough to warrant their demanding in return for their co-operation the recognition of some, at least, of the practical measures they desired; whilst, probably, there was no constituency in the kingdom in which electors who objected on principle to Church Establishments were so few that they would not be justified in demanding from a Liberal candidate, as a condition of their support, a distinct assurance that he would vote for the unconditional abolition of Church-rates and the throwing open of parochial graveyards to the ministration of Nonconformists. They should act with the Liberal party in future elections on the indispensable condition that, up to the measure of their strength on the local register, the objects about which they were interested should be advanced by the election; that, as a part of the Liberal force in each constituency, and in due proportion to that part, they should be recognised in the political programme of the candidate who wished to receive their assistance, and if that measure of justice were denied them, that they would withhold their co-operation, whatever might be the consequences to the Liberal party. Such a line of policy involved nothing but bare justice. It was only a necessary precaution against being overridden, and if it led to division the responsibility would rest on those who excluded them from all the good derived from union. It would lay the foundation of a political power which would extend as their principles extended, and plant the beginning of a healthy life in the very heart of incipient electoral death. It would bear fruit ultimately, if not at once, and gradually absorb into itself the best elements of the Liberal party, and effect a transition from the no-creed of to-day to the heart-stirring creed of to-morrow. It could not be followed by any real mischief. The worst result would be a change of administration, involving no change of policy, and that event might happen whether they claimed their rights at the next election or not. No doubt the adoption of such a policy would scare timid friends, and would incense the managers of the Liberal party, whose supremacy it would touch to the quick; but they would ultimately be obliged to succumb, for they needed the help of the voluntaries quite as much as the voluntaries needed theirs. It would be difficult in some cases to persuade their friends that they must thus act; but the friends of the Establishment would undoubtedly give their ecclesiastical principles the foremost place in their programme, if the friends of religious equality did not. It was not indispensable that they should succeed in every constituency, nor that they should win over all the voters coinciding with their views; for in many cases the two parties were so evenly balanced that a few votes would turn the scale, and the same was true of the two parties as a whole. They had ample time for preparation, and they must use it wisely and energetically. However uncompromising, they should be circumspect and moderate; going softly towards that which they dared boldly. Each constituency must be left to determine its own course; it being sought to infuse into it the right spirit. Above all, the suggested line of action must, if adopted, be adopted with their whole soul. Retreat would be out of the question. Everything must lead to the object aimed at. It must be the fly-wheel of their whole machinery. *Aut Caesar, aut nullus*, should be their maxim; or, to adopt words of more solemn import, they should resolve, with the Apostle, "This one thing will we do." (The paper was listened to with sustained interest, and was frequently applauded.)

Mr. CHARLES ROBERTSON, of Liverpool, moved the following resolution:—

That, in the judgment of this conference, it behoves the friends of religious equality to attach to their principles paramount importance in the use of their electoral power; while it believes that such an exercise of the Parliamentary franchise, at the present time, will not affect injuriously a single question of policy in which the country at large is interested. That, therefore, the conference rejoices at the determination of the executive committee of the Liberation Society to employ all the legitimate means at their command, to prevail on those Parliamentary electors who concur in the general objects of the society henceforward to make such demands on behalf of their principles as may be warranted by their strength on the local registers, and, in the event of a refusal, to withhold their support from candidates for their suffrages.

They were met, he said, to interchange opinions respecting the mode of action recommended by the executive committee of the Liberation Society, and endorsed by the London Conference during the past week. The action of the society had been so far, to a certain extent, an educational one. It had endeavoured to educate the members of the Nonconformist community. It had been endeavouring to diffuse a right opinion and feeling upon important points throughout the community at large; and, in addition, it had been endeavouring to educate Parliament, and bring before it those measures which were considered necessary for the full exercise of their principles. The society had arrived at a stage in which its very success had proved its failure, or rather defeat. They had so far got the mind of Parliament with them that alarm had been excited in the minds of their opponents, who had therefore striven to bring about a reaction. (Hear, hear.) In the face of those facts it behoved them to decide what steps were next to be taken. The admirable paper just read by Mr. Miall occupied the ground most fully. They had to consider the position

of parties as at present existing in the House of Commons and in the country at large. The balance between these parties was so nice that it might at any moment pass from one side to the other. So far, the Liberal party had been losing ground in the present Parliament, and the probabilities were that the character of the next Parliament would be still more opposed to the Liberation Society. The question now was, therefore, how best could their principles be placed before the constituencies at the next general election? There never was a time more favourable for pursuing such a course than the present. There was no question of great interest before the public at the present time which drew a decided line of demarcation between the two parties. The Liberal party were as little in favour of Reform as the Tories. The great majority would rather see the question shirked altogether than brought up for discussion. The fact was, the Liberal party had been thoroughly demoralised by its leaders. They had professed sentiments which they never intended to be carried through, and it was no secret at all that the loss of the last Reform Bill was not so much owing to the opposition of the Tories as to the half-hearted support of its friends. The attention of the constituencies should be prominently called to the principles avowed by the society. This course would perhaps produce alienation and opposition from some of those with whom they had been accustomed to act in concert. But this should not hinder their progress. In the course of their movements as a party there must come a period when they would be compelled to separate from the political friends who had formerly supported them. (Hear, hear.) Many of these political friends did not appreciate the objects the society had at heart; they gave a certain assent to certain measures which they considered to be demanded by political justice, but whenever the question was put whether religious ascendancy was to be maintained, then they failed to support it. The policy of the society must be such as to induce the Liberal party to abandon that course of action. Some might object to the resolution because it would perhaps have the effect of letting the Tories in. In his opinion the Tories had been in for some years—(cheers)—and the leaders of the Liberal party had been doing the work of the Conservatives much better than the latter party could have done it themselves. The great point, however, appeared to be the difficulty of securing unanimity among those who agreed with their principles. They had to do a great work, in convincing their own friends of the importance of standing by the principles of the society, whatever might be the consequence. For all that they must, however, be prepared, and their plans must be laid with a view to secure the hearty co-operation of their friends, and if they could show a good case they would gain over a great many who, at the first blush, might be disposed to stand aloof, or regard their movements with suspicion. They were doing a great good to the Liberal party themselves by taking a decided stand on this question. (Loud cheers.) The Liberal party was dying of political apathy; they had no well-defined object in view, nor did they know their own strength or value their own principles. The Liberation Society, however, came forward with a measure which was not sectarian, but which was calculated to promote the general welfare of the country. (Applause.)

Mr. HENRY LEE, of Salford, seconded the resolution. One of the reasons, he said, arising out of the resolution was that the plan described would do much towards simplifying their course of action as a Liberal party. He had hitherto abstained from mixing actively with any political party, feeling that the sacrifice of principle sometimes involved in committing one's self to the Liberal party was greater than he cared to make. The resolution before the meeting gave them, however, a simple purpose to follow out. At the present time the purpose for which the Liberation Society was established was one which commanded universal attention, and in the course of a short time would lead to universal discussion. The plan would also concentrate their efforts, which had hitherto been rather diffuse. Electronally, the objectors to the Established Church had not been able to act together; but Mr. Miall's plan would enable them to effect more than they had ever accomplished before. (Applause.)

Mr. G. HADFIELD, M.P., supported the resolution. He said he was anxious to express his approval of some specific plain course that the country could understand. The difficulties before them might appear to be insurmountable, if they looked at nothing else; but there never was a more favourable time than the present for working against these obstacles. (Cheers.) Whenever they obtained the victory—as obtain it they would—they would be able to boast, as Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright boasted of in another cause, that the conquered were the parties who were chiefly benefited. This was not a conflict for mere party, but for a cause—the great cause of religion, in which those who opposed them were all deeply interested. A remarkable fact was, that in all the controversies which had taken place, their opponents had never dared to assert that the efforts made to displace them were made with the view of occupying their place. Six millions a-year was certainly a very nice stake for anybody to have; but it would be their ruin if their opponents gave it to them. The bill to which Mr. Miall had referred, and in which he (M. H.) was interested, he had carried five times, and four times the noble lords, led on by the prelates, had thrown it out. (Applause.) As Lord Chelmsford said, it was a bridle upon Dissenters' consciences. And what said Mr. Glad-

stone?—"The danger is not from the hon. member for Sheffield, nor from those who think with him. The danger is in ourselves." (Applause.) And in the face of the Government and the House of Commons, Mr. Gladstone thanked him and Mr. Baines, on their motion for the third reading of the bill, for "a measure which was calculated to remove a stain from the Church." The bill had been thrown out four times on a division in the House of Lords, and each time the bishops had by their votes helped to throw it out. In the four divisions which had taken place twenty-four bishops' votes had been given against this bill, not for the security of the Church, as Lord Derby admitted, but because it was the beginning of a system which his lordship could not agree with. This course of proceeding was little better than a sort of dementation amongst the right rev. bishops. (Applause.) Why could they not as a Liberation Society do as the Corn-law League did? They had among them lecturers as powerful; and he hoped the time was not far distant when the leading men amongst them would put their hands into their pockets and raise 200,000/. if necessary. (Applause.) Their power hitherto had been of a moral kind; but if their influential men did in the days of the Corn-law agitation, the country would soon be convinced, and great practical results accomplished. The House of Commons was the breath of the nostrils of the people of the United Kingdom. Let the public voice once be raised on some great question, and the echo would soon be answered in the House of Commons. And there never was a time when that voice could be more opportunely raised than at the present moment. In the census of 1851 it was shown that the attendance at Dissenting places of public worship exceeded by 300,000 the attendance at the churches in England and Wales. In 1861 the Church people dared not try the experiment again. (Loud applause.) Mr. Baines challenged them to do it, but in vain. The bishops had actually conferred with the late Secretary of the Home Department, and the result was that the census was not taken as it was taken before. Who were in a majority in Scotland? Even with the moderate form of Establishment existing there, the Church had not one-third of the people, while in Ireland it had not one-eighth part of the population. (Loud applause.) In the *Times* of Monday there was a letter signed by a Catholic Irish landlord on the subject of the Established Church in Ireland. The writer concluded by saying that, so far from wishing the Catholic Church to share in the endowments, he believed that the endowment of the Catholic Church in Ireland would be one of the worst calamities that could befall the country. If that were the opinion of the Catholic body in Ireland, the Established Church of that country was not worth many years' purchase. Let but seven-eighths of the people come forward and say the Establishment must cease, and it would be beyond the power of Whig or Tory to avert its fall. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. HUGH MASON said he rose to suggest a slight modification of the resolution which had been moved, seconded, and supported. He did so with very great diffidence, inasmuch as it had been brought forward and supported by men whom he was glad to recognise as the champions of the policy which the society had hitherto pursued. He was afraid that in suggesting this slight modification he might be suspected, perhaps accused, of recommending what might be termed a timid and time-serving policy. Upon that point he had only to say that he was an ardent supporter of the Liberation Society, and hoped he should always continue to be so. But to the last line of the resolution before the meeting he most earnestly begged to direct the attention of the conference. With the preceding part of the resolution he most heartily agreed. He was quite of opinion that henceforward they should make such demands on behalf of their principles as might be warranted by their strength on the electoral register. But when the resolution went so far as to say in effect, that "In the event of a refusal I pledge myself to disenfranchise myself!" without the slightest reference to the times and circumstances of the occasion, he must, as an individual, decline to make such a pledge. Although he stood there not bound and fettered by party ties, he acknowledged party obligations, and the great achievements which the battles of his party had, up to the present time, accomplished. There might be times and circumstances before them when some other great question beyond that which had been referred to would be the question of the hour. And if that were the case, how could he, as a prudent and sensible man, ignore the circumstances of the times, and bind himself to carry out what would be most inopportune at the moment? He did not agree with Mr. Robertson that the Tories were in already. He had no doubt that if the Tories had been really in for the past few years, the policy which would have been suggested to the country by that party would not by any means have received the support of the great Liberal party of the country. He objected to passing a judgment upon the state of parties in the present day, apart from the history of those parties. He looked back upon the history of this country for many years; and while he saw in the Liberal party certain mistakes made, a certain amount of timidity, and certain shortcomings exhibited at times, he saw nothing in the history of parties for the last forty years which would lead him for one single moment to say in the present day that there was no difference between the Tory and Liberal parties in this country. He believed the difference was enormous. He believed that it was by the working of individual members of

the party, and not by being separated from them, that success was achieved. It was by identifying themselves with the party to which they belonged that they had been able to do for the Liberation Society what had been done already. He objected to pronounce that that Cabinet which partly supported, at least, the measures advocated by the Liberation Society was no better than a Cabinet which steadily opposed their every measure. He denied that the Liberal party which had fought the battles of the society was identically the same as the party which had opposed them. He did not think it wise at this time of day to take a course which would bring about what was anticipated in the concluding portion of Mr. Miall's excellent paper. The fact was, as a society, they could not afford this time to lose any of their friends. He did not think it was the way to strengthen their position in the country to take a course which would deprive them of any of their friends, even although some of them did not go as far and to so full an extent as they would like them to go. Such men must be won over by degrees, and instead of by a kind of *coup de main* driving them away, he would much rather by reason and argument bind them closer to the society, and make them more identically one with it. There was no denying the fact that, for some little time past, the uppermost question had been, and for some little time to come it probably would continue to be, the foreign policy of the Government. The question had been one of peace or war. He believed that during the time of the Italian struggle for independence, if the Tory party had been in power, that great moral support would never have been given to the noble people who were fighting for their liberties by the Government and the Parliament of the country—a support which was of the greatest advantage to that people, and which undoubtedly aided them immensely in the success of that great struggle. And for what were they struggling? Were they struggling for religious liberty or not? Most unquestionably they were; and therefore he claimed to have the right to judge at any time what should be his course of action at any future election. He would rather have half a loaf than no bread at all; and so if he found a party in power disposed to give a considerable amount of support to them; and if, by displacing that party, as he believed it was in the power of the Nonconformists to do, he brought in a party who would not give them the same support, he certainly was not wisely supporting the principles with which he was identified. Generally speaking, he was no friend of pledges, and would rather let a man take his own unbiased course in determining every case upon its own merits. He sincerely hoped the meeting would omit in the resolution the concluding words,—“and, in the event of a refusal, to withdraw their support from candidates for their suffrages.”

Mr. ROBERTSON said that there was no pledge involved in the resolution.

Mr. HUGH MASON said he must still maintain that the pledge was most distinct.

Mr. E. MIALL said he thought Mr. Mason had somewhat misapprehended the drift of the policy which was recommended to the conference in the paper which had just been read. There was no intention in the slightest degree to pledge any individual, whether belonging to the conference or elsewhere, to a particular course of action, under any and all circumstances, at the next general election. This resolution simply expressed the opinion of those who supported it, of a certain policy to this effect:—that it was quite time now for Dissenters to make their principles paramount in the mode of applying their electoral and political power; to give them, in fact, the first place, and to make the support of the general Liberal party secondary to that object. It appeared to him that to withdraw the last line of the resolution would be just to take the whole meaning out of the proposition altogether. They always had professed to give their principles a certain amount of consideration; but every one knew that unless they had an alternative, as it were, it was impossible to do anything in the conduct of an election. If this line were taken out, they might as well not meet together at all. Mr. Mason, even supposing he held up his hand for this resolution, would be at perfect liberty to do in Ashton-under-Lyne at the next general election that which he and those who thought with him there might consider to be the wisest course to be pursued at that particular election. All that was asked by the resolution was this—that they, as supporters of the principles of the Liberation Society, should insist upon having their estimate of themselves and their principles recognised at the general election. He did not ask them to say they would vote this way or that way, but he did think that when it came out that Manchester had, as it were, snipped out the only practical part of the paragraph, it would be thought that Manchester men had some special reasons, strong in their own minds, but not yet given to the world, why they threw a little doubt upon the policy which had been recommended by the executive committee, and left the matter as vaguely open as it was before.

Mr. MASON said that Mr. Miall's explanations had strengthened his previously-expressed views. All that Mr. Miall wished was to be obtained by ending the resolution at the words, “local registers.” He (Mr. M.), would therefore propose as an amendment that the resolution before the meeting conclude at the word, “registers.”

The Rev. F. SKINNER, of Blackburn, suggested an alteration of a few words, which he said would meet Mr. Mason's views, viz., the addition after the words “local registers” of the words, “that in the event of a refusal they should consider the propriety of with-

holding their support from candidates for their suffrages.” Mr. JOHNSON, of Liverpool, seconded this amendment.

Mr. T. PIDDUCK, of Hanley, agreed with the original resolution, although he acknowledged that the interpretation put upon it by Mr. Mason would sometimes involve difficulty. The Rev. A. McLAREN pointed out that the resolution expressed approval of the policy adopted by the London committee, and the conference should merely express its approval or disapproval. Mr. LEWIS, of Manchester, supported the original motion, as did the Rev. J. BROWN, of Bamford. At this stage Mr. BUCKNALL, of Wigan, having seconded Mr. Mason's amendment, that of Mr. Skinner was withdrawn. The Rev. R. J. MUNCASTER then spoke in favour of the motion, and the Rev. J. G. ROGERS, of Ashton, in favour of the amendment.

Mr. MIALL said he wished to say on behalf of the executive committee, that they had not recommended this policy without having gone over pretty nearly the whole ground that had engaged the attention of the conference, and the more thoroughly the question had been discussed in the sub-committee the nearer they came to that unanimity which characterised their final decision. He really thought there was no substantial difference between Mr. Mason and the executive committee. It ought to be remembered that as friends of religious equality they were not obtruding upon the public any speculative political opinions of their own. Their course was simply a defensive one. They had been put off from the ground which as citizens they had a right to occupy, and those who came to them saying that they approved of their being placed in an inferior position in relation to national things on account of their religious faith, ought certainly to be the persons to be called upon to justify their position. It was not his intention to deny historically the advantages that had been achieved for their society by the Liberal party, the members of the society themselves being a main and active proportion of that party; but he did think that, there being no great domestic question of policy before the country, it was the time for them,—who had never yet received that which was due to their strength and the justness of their principles,—to put some sort of appreciation upon themselves. If they chose they might go on as they had done for years to come, and be treated with that superciliousness and contempt with which they had been treated in days that were passed.

He for one regarded himself in the first place as owing a duty to himself, to his principles, and to his relationship to the Church. The very position in which the law placed a Dissenter on account of his religious convictions and faith was a violation of justice, and trampled upon his self-respect; and if a man insisted upon keeping him undermost he was not fairly fulfilling his duty to himself, because this man agreed with him perhaps on some foreign question, to make him the representative about this very question of ascendancy or inferiority. If that man would come to him and say, “Give me your vote for general purposes, purposes of our party, purposes of foreign politics”; and he asked him, “Will you let me stand upon the same level with my fellow-men, I being loyal and submissive to the law; will you let me stand upon a level with them irrespectively of the religious opinions I hold towards God, or will you not?” If that man said that he would not, then he (Mr. Miall), under all the circumstances would not support him at the election. Mr. Mason talked of this as disfranchising oneself. The mere abstaining from giving a vote was not disfranchisement. The power exercised by refusal was surely quite as great as the power exercised by giving a vote. Indeed, in some cases he should say it was greater, and a man was disfranchising himself by obliging himself to vote between two persons where there was no difference of principles, and where he was not consulted whether those principles were approved by him or not. On that ground, therefore, he did not think there was any strong objection. But there was something further. He had a relation to these principles he professed, and he asked, “When should they be put in their proper place?” They had, with the utmost fidelity, and he sometimes thought with a fidelity that had humiliated them, gone after the Liberal party when it had dragged them through the mire. But had they even done this for the principles of their society? They had spoken about them, lectured about them, preached about them, and sometimes made professions at an election. And then came some scion of a lordly house to ask for their votes, and they ran after him as if he were representing their views; and oftentimes, such was the madness excited at elections, they made sacrifices which would have gone far towards placing them high above contempt, to give him a victory. Was this to go on or not? Was it a fitting thing that their society should endeavour to persuade all Parliamentary electors to think with them about their great principles, and to try and make those Parliamentary electors do their duty to their principles? Much as he felt the importance of trying to help oppressed nationalities, he regarded it as a prior duty to promote, in this centre of the whole earth, the spirituality and the purity of the Church of Christ. Even as regards the foreign policy of the country, he believed that it would be decided by public opinion, let who would be in office. He remembered that while Lord Malmesbury, when in office, was constantly assailed by Liberals in regard to his Italian policy, no sooner had Lord Russell succeeded him, than he (Lord Russell) stated he had read all his predecessor's despatches, and saw nothing to object to in them. Nor could he (Mr.

M.) forget that when they were called upon to support Lord Palmerston's foreign policy, they were, in fact, asked to support such outrages on humanity as that of the recent bombardment in Japan, and such filibustering expeditions as those now working so mischievously in China. He hoped Providence would favour them in such a way as that they should be able to express their attachment to their principles, as well as their desire to serve other peoples who were subject to oppression. But do not let them mistake, and be dragged away from a fair discrimination of the case by those cries which always came down from the uppermost places in which Cabinets resided. There was really no question before the country which should induce them to put their principles second. Their policy was not for immediate results. He did not ask them to say that they would vote for nobody who would not give effect to all his principles; but merely asked them to look round, and take such measures as might fairly be adopted to ask for what they were entitled to, and if they did not receive that, not to vote at all. Their object was to create something like life where there now was death. (Applause.)

Mr. ROBERTSON, as the mover of the resolution, briefly replied to some of the objections offered.

The amendment was then voted upon, and was supported by not quite twelve votes. Most of the conference held up their hands against it, and the original resolution was then carried with two dissentients.

CHURCH-RATE AGITATION IN THE PARISHES.

The Rev. C. WILLIAMS, of Accrington, then moved the following resolution:

That, since both Houses of Parliament have refused to abolish Church-rates, and have thereby necessitated the continuance of the parochial agitation, this conference earnestly recommends all ratepayers who are opposed to the exaction to labour with fresh energy for its extinction in their own parishes, and to do so with the distinct purpose of availing themselves of the facilities afforded by vestry contests for promoting the ultimate object of the society—the abandonment of all compulsory means for the maintenance of religion.

Mr. Williams briefly placed the motion before the conference, but, as will be seen, spoke more fully in reply.

Mr. R. RUMNEY, of Manchester, seconded the resolution. He said it appeared from the returns that the gross amount of Church-rates collected in 1829 was £19,000.; the number of parishes was not given. In 1859 there were 10,206 parishes, from which was collected £60,000. In 1862, from 9,134 parishes, there was collected £232,905.; in 1859, out of 10,206 parishes, the compulsory Church-rate was levied in 8,115; in 1861, out of 11,605 parishes, 2,188 refused; in 1862, out of 12,408 parishes, 3,274 refused. Whatever the state of the House of Commons, in the country it was clear they were not going backward. Another interesting fact was the application of the money raised. It had been contended that the money was required for repairs, or that we should have the country filled with dilapidated churches. But it appeared that the proportion devoted to ordinary repairs in 1862 was £8,577.; the extraordinary expenses were £47,767., leaving for purposes of worship £106,344., or nearly one-half. In the diocese of Manchester, in 1862, the compulsory rate yielded £3,185.; the number of parishes contributing that rate was 108 out of 308. The returns of 1859 were obtained from Mr. Walpole, and in 1861 and 1862 from the Home Office. He thought they ought to be thankful to the Lords that they did not abolish Church-rates when they were first asked, or else the members of the society would have lost a school in which their principles were being taught, and in which every year they were able to pass a competitive examination quite as interesting as any in the country. (Applause.) He could only hope, interested as they all were in the progress of Christ's kingdom and religious truth and liberty, that the Lords would continue to throw out the Church-rate Abolition Bill until they were able to bring into the contest a more thorough recognition of the principles for which they were contending. (Applause.)

The Rev. W. KNOX, of Kirkham, urged the importance of rendering pecuniary assistance to those who were engaged in contesting the legality of Church-rates in rural districts. He called attention to the Kirkham case, in which the rate had been declared bad, but the objectors had to pay their costs—a decision which they had appealed from to the Privy Council. He said that if the result of following the directions of the society was to be of such a character, it would be useless to think of continuing the warfare in country parishes; and the matter ought, therefore, to be seriously dealt with.

Mr. MIALL said it was quite at the option of anyone whether he would appear before the Ecclesiastical Court, and thereby take the decision out of the hands of the magistrates. He should in very few cases, or never, except where some great principle of law was concerned, ruling a great number of cases all over the country, recommend going to the expense of a contest in the Ecclesiastical Court merely for the sake of crushing a local rate. What the resolution recommended was that they should always get up a contest, by which was meant attending the vestry, moving an amendment, making speeches thereon, and avail themselves of the opportunity to preach their principles. (Applause.)

The Rev. C. WILLIAMS, in reply, said those who were concerned in these local contests had difficulties to contend with which gentlemen who lived in wealthy cities like Manchester had scarcely any conception of. If they were to have these vestry contests they should have some regard to what would be the issue of them. As he (Mr. W.) understood, Mr. Knox was anxious they should not commit themselves hurriedly to a course of action that might

involve them in great difficulties. He (Mr. W.) differed from him as to the desirability of these local contests. It was evident that they must not hope for much from Parliament; they must turn their attention to what they could do out of doors. They must expect in local agitations to be misunderstood and misrepresented. That was inevitable. Their friends on the other side could not understand that they really wished well to the Episcopal Church. Yet they must insist on that, and should continually keep before the minds of those among whom they agitated this fact, that this society simply and exclusively dealt with certain relations of the Church to the people at large, and wished to liberate them from control and to free themselves from compulsion. If they only did that, he believed they would take the great body of Church people with them. The Liberation Society could not undertake to guarantee expenses. It would not be wise to do so. (Hear.) It was a wholesome check that those who agitated should pay for agitation when it was over, instead of counting on a fund in London. (Loud cheers.) If the agitation were conducted wisely, money was always forthcoming. When their Church friends understood them, they would subscribe to their funds. If they went on the supposition that Church people would always be their enemies, they might reckon on failure and that there would be in the Church what was seen now—a growing disposition to unite with the Conservative party and oppose all reform whatever, whether in Church or State.

The resolution was passed unanimously.

CIRCULATION OF PUBLICATIONS.

The Rev. J. G. ROGERS (Ashton) moved the first resolution:—

That, looking to the present state of the Church as by law established, and the anxiety of an increasing number of its members to be freed from the legislative restrictions now necessarily imposed upon them, the conference deems it to be the special duty of Voluntaries widely to circulate publications adapted to influence the minds of that class of the community.

The power of the press as an agency for the dissemination of their principles was not to be lost sight of by the society. It was of the utmost importance that this power should be brought into use. The way in which the press was employed by their opponents was surprising, and could only be appreciated by those who had looked closely into the question. There was another point too which was important. The Nonconformists were not fully aware of the quality of the literature issued by societies which were supported largely by their contributions, in which the colouring, from first to last, was on the side of the Established Church. (Hear, hear.) There was therefore a great power in the press which was made use of against them; and it was a power with which they must enter into the contest, and wield against their opponents. (Applause.) He sincerely trusted that the Liberation Society would be able to work that great engine with more efficiency, in the way of distributing information amongst the public, than they had hitherto done. Anyone who wished to support this work might do so on the easiest terms; for the executive would supply publications gratis to those who would distribute them. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. J. B. KENNERLEY, of Manchester, seconded the resolution, and said that he believed that no great measure, either political or religious, would ever attain success without a very energetic use of the press of the kingdom.

The resolution was passed, after a statement from the secretary, to the effect that if the names and addresses of Episcopalians were sent for the purpose, the society would forward to them copies of Mr. Nevile's recently-published pamphlet—an announcement which was loudly cheered.

INCOME OF THE SOCIETY.

Mr. CARVELL WILLIAMS said he should introduce the subject of money without a single apologetic word, for no man knew better than the members of that conference that such a struggle as that in which they were engaged could not be carried on without a considerable expenditure; and he believed also that no men would be more willing to give their share of the required funds. (Cheers.) The conference had passed a resolution, the carrying out of which would involve an immense amount of work, some of which must needs be costly. The executive committee had, in fact, come to the conclusion that the income must be increased this year from 4,000*l.* to 5,000*l.*, and he hoped that would be accepted as a modest estimate, and one which they might hope to realise. (Hear, hear.) The speaker then furnished particulars of the sums received from Lancashire, and as the amount had, of course, been affected by the cotton famine, he trusted that the society would share in the advantage of the better times which all hoped there was in store for the people of Lancashire. While the supporters of the Establishment had been exulting for the last two years over their Parliamentary triumphs, they could not conceal their mortification that, in spite of failures in Parliament, the Liberation Society was well supported financially throughout the country. State-Church advocates called on their own supporters to manifest their zeal on behalf of their cause in the same way; but their appeals met with no adequate response. He hoped that the Liberation Society would continue to enjoy that superiority. (Cheers.)

Mr. JOSEPH THOMPSON, of Bowden, then moved the following resolution on the subject:—

That, having regard to the successful results of the past operations of the Liberation Society, and to the necessity for now carrying on its work with increased vigour, the conference recognises the great importance of placing additional resources at the disposal of the executive committee, and

expresses its earnest hope that its friends in this district will, so far as existing circumstances permit, assist in realising that object.

He urged the necessity for hard work, and the exertion of personal influence to give effect to the resolution, and said he was prepared to largely increase his own subscription.

Mr. J. PETRIE, of Rochdale, said, as one who had been a local treasurer of the society ever since it was formed, he had peculiar pleasure in seconding the motion, and would do his best to carry it out.

The motion was then passed,

[It was subsequently stated at the dinner-table that Mr. Sidebottom had promised to contribute 50*l.* for the next three years. Several sums of 10*l.* and 5*l.* a-year have, we understand, since been promised—some of them in lieu of guinea subscriptions previously given—and it is not unlikely that the sum raised in Manchester will be doubled.]

VOTES OF THANKS.

The programme having been exhausted, Professor NEWTH moved, and the Rev. A. FRAZER, of Blackburn, seconded, a motion warmly thanking the deputation for their attendance, and especially Mr. Miall for his valuable paper—a motion which was heartily passed, and responded to by Mr. MIALL.

The Rev. W. B. MCWILLIAM, of Altringham, proposed, and Alderman HOOLE, of Blackburn, seconded, a vote of thanks to the conference secretaries, to the chairman, and to the gentlemen who had undertaken the labour of arranging for the conference. This was acknowledged by the Rev. P. THOMPSON and by Mr. WARBURTON, who, it was stated, had worked with a degree of energy and perseverance which entitled him to the warmest thanks of the conference.

The CHAIRMAN'S acknowledgment closed the proceedings, about half-past three.

The members of the conference then adjourned to an adjoining room, where the liberality of the society's Manchester friends had provided a handsome entertainment. Tea was also partaken of subsequently, and the day's proceedings were closed by the public meeting in the Free Trade Hall, a report of which will be found in the body of the paper.

Religious Intelligence.

SPECIAL SUNDAY SERVICES.—The preachers at these services on Sunday last were as follows:—Standard Theatre, Rev. Kilby Jones; Sadler's Wells Theatre, Rev. J. Clifford, B.A.; Victoria Theatre, Rev. J. Baker; St. James's Hall, afternoon, Rev. Newman Hall—evening, Rev. J. S. Pearsall; Britannia Theatre, evening, Rev. A. M'Auslane; Pavilion Theatre, Rev. G. Martin.

WHITECHAPEL.—The second anniversary of Sion New Chapel, South-street, Whitechapel-road, was celebrated on Thursday, Nov. 5th, by a tea and public meeting. The chapel was beautifully decorated with appropriate mottoes and devices. Nearly 300 persons partook of tea, and a public meeting was afterwards held under the presidency of Samuel Morley, Esq. The pastor, the Rev. J. Thomas, B.A. read a most encouraging report of the progress and development of the church and congregation during the past year; twenty-two new members had been received into church-fellowship, making forty-five in the two years. The societies were in a prosperous condition: there had been raised during the twelve months for various purposes upwards of 300*l.*, the only liability now being the 500*l.* due to Messrs. Link, and it was suggested that an attempt should be made to find five gentlemen who would lend each 100*l.* free of interest. The operations of the Sunday-school were as extended as the circumstances of the place would allow. Mr. Taylor, one of the deacons, in the name of the church rose to express the unfeigned pleasure they felt in the review of their united efforts during the year just now closed; the people were thoroughly united and happy, and one in sympathy and affectionate regard toward their pastor. The collection by the ladies and the proceeds of the tea amounted to 25*l.*, which together with a donation of 25*l.* from Mr. Morley, was then handed to Mr. Thomas. The Rev. J. Thomas, who laboured under strong emotion, expressed his deep obligation to the friends for their unexpected token of affectionate regard and esteem, and especially to Mr. Morley for his kindness and generosity on several former occasions. Mr. Morley said it gave him great satisfaction to find such marked indications of God's blessing in their midst. Mr. Thomas's self-sacrificing labours were a positive heroism, and he was prepared to do anything he could to assist them in carrying out their projects. He was willing to be one of the five gentlemen required to lend 100*l.* free of interest, on the understanding that the 25*l.* saved be given to increase the pastor's income. The meeting was subsequently addressed by the Revs. W. Dorling and J. Bowrey, Joseph Payne, Esq., and other gentlemen.

ST. PAUL'S CHAPEL, SOUTHSEA.—The annual meeting of the church and congregation, and the different societies connected with this place, was held on the 18th inst. The lecture-room, elegantly decorated, was crowded, and many were accommodated in the chapel. The chair was taken at seven o'clock by the Rev. J. Hunt Cooke, the minister. The reports of the different societies were read. The Sabbath schools were in prosperity. The Mission Auxiliary had collected during the past year more than half as much again as in any previous year. A Dorcas' Society had been established during the year, and was prospering. A Christian Instruction

Society had 400 bouses in the worst part of the neighbourhood under visitation; this, too, had been originated during the year. Altogether the reports spoke of progress. The proceedings were made interesting by addresses from gentlemen belonging to the place, and by recitations of selections from English literature by young men, whose elocution was highly applauded. An able choir, under the direction of Mr. Tilly, varied the engagements by some good music.

HILLHOUSE, HUDDERSFIELD.—In our last number we announced the laying of the foundation-stone of a new Congregational chapel in this suburb of Huddersfield, and briefly described a subsequent public meeting in connection with it. On the last-named occasion, the Rev. R. Bruce, of Highfield Chapel, said that the present position of the two Independent churches in the town was such as to warrant the extension of their borders and the making of aggressive efforts upon that growing suburb of Huddersfield, and he was prepared to give, to labour, and to make sacrifices, that that undertaking might come to a successful issue. In the locality where the new church was about to be built, he had now about thirty families who regularly attended his chapel, and he supposed about 100 scholars, and though he would not like to lose a single friend when considered personally, he should be quite pleased if those friends of his would gather round the new church, and be the first nucleus of that church, which he hoped would be in future time as successful, as prosperous, and as numerous as the old church at Highfield, or the sister church at Ramsden-street. The chairman here stated that the late Mr. Willans had promised something like twenty-five per cent. on the cost of their new chapel; and although he was now dead, his family were prepared to carry his intentions into effect. He also observed that Mr. Willans' four sons had requested to be allowed to erect the spire at their own cost, in honour of their father's memory. After a brief address from J. W. Willans, Esq., who had laid the foundation-stone of the new chapel, Mr. Wright Mellor, the Rev. T. Stevenson, Mr. C. H. Jones, and other gentlemen, also spoke, and before the company separated, the amount subscribed had been increased to 2,400*l.*

WINDSOR.—A special service in connection with the settlement of the Rev. S. Eastman as pastor of the church assembling at William-street Chapel, in this town, was held on Tuesday evening, Oct. 27. The attendance was very large. The Rev. W. Roberts, M.A., of Notting-hill, London, opened the service by reading a portion of Scripture and offering prayer. The Rev. W. Legg, B.A., of Reading, asked the usual questions. The Rev. J. Rowland, of Henley, offered the special prayer. The Rev. J. Kennedy, M.A., of Stepney, London, delivered the address to the minister. The Rev. J. Stoughton, of Kensington, London, addressed the church and congregation. On Wednesday evening a tea and public meeting, in connection with the same event, was held in the schoolroom. The newly-elected pastor commenced the meeting by giving out a hymn, after which Dr. Knowles (Wesleyan) offered prayer. Three of the deacons of Mile-end Chapel were present, and spoke in the highest terms of their late pastor. They felt certain that nothing would have induced him to leave, nor would they willingly have parted with him, were it not that his reason for seeking a change was chiefly the hope that the health of his beloved wife would be greatly benefited by residing in the country. Three deacons of the church at William-street next addressed the meeting. The Rev. J. S. Hall, of Falcon-square Chapel, London, addressed the meeting in an earnest speech. He spoke in the highest praise of the pastor, and stated that he had known him for many years. A. Merriels, Esq., of Upton Park, next spoke. The Rev. W. Tyler (called, because of his labours, "The Apostle of Spitalfields") gave an excellent address, recommending union among the people and constant willingness to help the pastor in every way, and concluded by addressing the pastor most affectionately as one whom he had known and loved for many years. After brief remarks from Dr. Knowles and the Rev. S. Gray (Baptist), the meeting was closed with the Doxology and prayer.

THE LATE REV. G. C. MAITLAND, M.A.—An elegant monumental tablet has recently been placed in the Fawcett-street Congregational Church, Sunderland, to the memory of the late esteemed and talented pastor of the church. The following inscription, from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Ferguson, is placed upon it:—"In Memoriam—The Rev. George C. Maitland, M.A., whose intellectual endowments and moral qualities, whose Christian manhood and child-like disposition, whose transparency of character, strength of friendship, and constancy of affection, whose unyielding attachment to principle, united with the most catholic largeness of spirit, whose evangelical ministry and pastoral fidelity, whose private virtues and whose public activities, endeared him to all who knew him. He died Nov. 23, 1862, aged thirty. Erected by the members of the church and congregation among whom he lived and laboured as a faithful minister of Jesus Christ for seven years, and whose early removal they most deeply deplore." The monument, as a work of art, reflects great credit upon the sculptor, Mr. Craggs, of Newcastle. It is made of pure white marble, on a black ground, and the tablet is surmounted by a very chaste mural urn, after the Grecian style, which gives the whole design a very unique appearance.